EXHIBIT 16

CONFIDENTIAL

In accordance with a protective order, the enclosure(s) shall be treated as confidential and shall not be shown to any person other than those persons designated in paragraph 8.2 of the paragraph order.

	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING
3	
4	CUSTODIA BANK, INC.,
5	Plaintiff
6	vs. No.
7	FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD OF 22-cv-00125-SWS
8	GOVERNORS and FEDERAL RESERVE
9	BANK OF KANSAS CITY,
10	Defendant.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	CONFIDENTIAL DEPOSITION OF JUDITH HAZEN,
16	FRBKC Representative, a Defendant, taken on behalf of
17	the Plaintiff before Kelsey Robbins Schmalz, CSR No.
18	1571, CCR No. 1148, RPR, pursuant to Notice on the
19	16th of November, 2023, at the offices of the Federal
20	Reserve Bank of Kansas City, 1 Memorial Drive, Kansas
21	City, Missouri.
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 76
1	communicated to Wyoming representatives that there
2	was a problem with having a resolution plan be
3	developed within six months of commencing operations?
4	MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form and
5	outside the scope.
6	A. I don't know if it was conveyed that
7	we had concerns with not having a plan for resolution
8	until an entity was operating.
9	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
LO	Q. When did the Kansas City Fed first
L1	have concerns around the timing of developing a
L2	resolution plan for a SPDI?
L3	MS. CARLETTA: Same objections. Form
L4	and outside the scope.
L5	A. Based on the typos here, I would say
L6	as early at December of 2018 we had concerns.
L7	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
L8	Q. And which talking point are you
L9	specifically referencing?
20	A. I'm sorry.
21	Q. I ask because I don't see it on those
22	talking points.
23	A. I misspoke. Let me confirm that
24	they're not in here.
25	I don't know the specific date that

Page 77 1 the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City identify that 2 had as a concern. 3 Ο. And as you sit here today, is it fair to say that you can't point to any time that that 4 5 concern would have been communicated to Wyoming 6 representatives while the SPDI charter legislation 7 was being drafted? Objection. 8 MS. CARLETTA: Form. I don't know if it was communicated 9 Α. 10 during the drafting of the legislation. 11 BY MR. SCARBOROUGH: 12 Okay. Let's put that document to the Ο. 13 side, and we can also put Exhibit 227 to the side for 14 And before I move completely off of it, the moment. during any of the discussions that occurred between 15 16 Kansas City Fed officers and Wyoming representatives 17 around the SPDI charter legislation, was there any 18 representation made by the Kansas City Fed that a 19 SPDI was not going to be able to get a master account 2.0 since it didn't have a federal supervisor? 21 MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form. 22 I'm not aware of any comments made Α. 23 that a SPDI would or would not be able to get a 24 master account. I believe the conversation focused 25 on being clear that the decision would be with the

	Page 78
1	Reserve Bank or with the Federal Reserve.
2	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
3	Q. Was there any representation made that
4	a SPDI-chartered entity would not be able to get a
5	master account because it was not insured by the FDIC?
6	MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form.
7	A. Again, I think the feedback shared
8	during the drafting of the legislation was that the
9	decision on the master account would be that of the
10	Federal Reserve System.
11	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
12	Q. And so none of the feedback that was
13	given by Kansas City Fed officers said that having a
14	federal supervisor was essential to getting a master
15	account; is that fair?
16	MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form.
17	A. Again, in the context of the
18	conversations around the legislation, I think that
19	the comments that were provided around the master
20	account was clarity and where the decision stood.
21	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
22	Q. And same question for being FDIC
23	insured. None of the representatives of the Kansas
24	City Fed communicated to Wyoming representatives that
25	having FDIC insurance was essential to getting a

	Page 79
1	master account, right?
2	MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form.
3	A. Again, in the conversations around the
4	legislation, I believe the feedback on the master
5	account was clarity regarding the decision being with
6	the Reserve Bank.
7	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
8	Q. We were talking earlier about the
9	Monetary Control Act of 1980, and when the Kansas
LO	City Fed first took the position that it was simply a
L1	pricing statute. Do you remember that?
L2	A. I remember you framed it as I said it
L3	was simply a pricing statute.
L4	Q. Again, is that am I misrepresenting
L5	the position that the Kansas City Fed is taking on
L6	the Monetary Control Act of 1980?
L7	MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form.
L8	A. I didn't prepare to speak on behalf of
L9	the entire Monetary Control Act, but the specific
20	piece that you keep bringing up I do believe applies
21	to equal pricing or similar pricing for entities that
22	have access to services as determined by the Reserve
23	Bank.
24	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
25	Q. And that's a specific reference to

	Page 80
1	statutory Section 248?
2	A. That's my understanding.
3	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Can we mark as our
4	next exhibit 228.
5	(FRB Exhibit No. 228 was marked for
6	identification by the reporter.)
7	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
8	Q. I'll hand you Exhibit 228. Does the
9	Kansas City Fed publish an annual report?
10	A. We do.
11	Q. And does the annual report go out
12	under the president of the Kansas City Fed's
13	signature?
14	A. It currently does.
15	Q. And I've handed you the annual report
16	that went out under the signature of Roger Guffey,
17	president in January of 1981.
18	Do you see that?
19	A. I see that.
20	Q. And do you know that Roger Guffey was
21	the president of the Kansas City Fed at that time?
22	A. Based on this.
23	Q. To help you, if you turn to the third
24	page of the document page wise, it would be Page 5 if
25	they were numbered, do you see an officer list? At

	Page 81
1	the top it says officers and then reflects the
2	January 1st, 1981, date?
3	A. I see that.
4	Q. And it indicates that for the Federal
5	Reserve Bank of Kansas City, the president is Roger
6	Guffey?
7	A. I see that.
8	Q. The copy is not great so I apologize
9	for that, but I will try to read the first part here
10	so that it facilitates your understanding.
11	It says, The year 1980 was one of
12	change and challenge for the Federal Reserve Bank of
13	Kansas City and its branches in Denver, Oklahoma City
14	and Omaha.
15	Do you see that?
16	A. I do.
17	Q. And then it goes on to say, With the
18	passage of the Depository Institutions Deregulation
19	and Monetary Control Act, the financial industry
20	entered a new what's that word dynamic, I
21	believe, but it's difficult to read it for sure
22	strike that.
23	Entered a new economic environment
24	which is sure to make the '80s a dynamic time for all
25	financial institutions.

	Page 82
1	Did I read that correctly?
2	A. As well as I can read it. It's
3	difficult on the side.
4	Q. Right. There's nothing that I read
5	there that does not appear to reflect the document;
6	is that fair?
7	A. Correct, beyond the framing of that
8	new environment that I just can't make out.
9	Q. And does the Kansas City Fed agree
LO	that in the wake of the passage of the Monetary
L1	Control Act that there was a rapidly changing
L2	financial environment?
L3	MS. CARLETTA: Objection. Form.
L 4	Outside the scope. We did not agree to have the
L 5	witness testify on the entirety of the Monetary
L6	Control Act of 1980, and we discussed this in our
L7	meet and confer.
L8	A. I see the statement there.
L9	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
20	Q. Okay. President Guffey goes on to say
21	that the services provided by the Federal Reserve
22	Bank such as check clearing, wire transfer wire
23	transfer processing, occurrence and coin processing
24	and fiscal agency services will become directly
25	available to many more financial institutions. The